REMARKS

In the January 3, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 24 due to an informality, rejected claims 24, 27, 29 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement, rejected claims 35, 48 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite, rejected claims 18-23, 25-26, 28, 30-33, 35-36, 40-43 and 45-53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,914,727 to Horan et al., rejected claims 24, 27, 29 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horan et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,404,482 to Stamm et al., rejected claims 37-39 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horan et al and U..S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156973 to Ulrich et al., and rejected claim 44 un der §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horan et al.

With respect to the objection to claim 24, Applicants have amended claim 24 to deleted the repeated "wherein."

With respect to the rejection of claims 24, 27, 29 and 34 under §112(1), Applicants have amended those claims to recite elements clearly disclosed in the specification. Support for amended claim 24 may be found, for example, in paragraph [0083] of the specification. Support for amended claims 27 and 29 may be found, for example, in paragraph [0084]. Support for amended claim 34 may be found, for example in paragraphs [0067] and [0070].

With respect to the rejection of claim 35 under §112(2), Applicants have removed the language "substantial computing time" from the claim. With respect to the rejection of claim 48 under §112(2), Applicants again have removed the language cited by the

9

Examiner from the claim. With respect to claim 51, Applicants have amended the

dependency of the claim to correctly recite antecedent bases for the recited elements.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are patentable over Horan

et al. and Stamm et al. Independent claims 18 and 42, from which all other pending

claims depend, have been amended to clarify that the claimed "device ID" is an index to a

device entry in a device ID lookup table, and each device entry has device information

(such as the network and authentication information recited in dependant claims) for one

to connect to and access the associated device. In contrast, the "device ID" in Horan et al.

refers to a device identification number that is used to distinguish one device from the

other devices made by the same vendor with "vendor ID" (see FIGURE 22A of Horan et

al). Therefore the claimed device ID in the present invention has a totally different

meaning from the field of "BASE OF AGP DEVICE ADDRESS SPACE" in the

FIGURE 9 in Horan et al., in which that field refers to an actual base address. Similarly

the claimed "block ID" in the present invention is different from the field named "PAGE

OFFSET FROM AGP BASE ADDRESS" in FIGURE 9 in Horan et al., which is one or

two offsets (FIGURE 11 in Horan et al.) so that changing a block entry in block ID

lookup table (FIGURE 11) will require changing the associated "block ID", i.e. changing

the virtual address, or vise versa changing a "block ID" in a virtual address will require

changing the associated block entry in the block ID lookup table; whereas the "block ID"

in the claimed invention is an index to a block entry in a block ID table, and each block

entry has block information including not only a memory starting address, but also block

size, number of pages in the block and the other block information. Therefore the

advantage and flexibility of using a block index over using the one or two "base address"

10

or "offset" directly (i.e. starting address) is that we can change the block information including starting address in the block entry in the block ID lookup table to effectively change a memory location without changing the virtual address itself.

The other references cited by the Examiner do not cure these deficiencies of Horan et al.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2837.

Respectfully submitted,

24IP Law Group USA, PLLC

By: _____

Timothy R. DeWitt
Reg. No. 35,857

Date: April 3, 2006

24IP Law Group USA, PLLC
12 E. Lake Dr.
Annapolis, MD 21403

11